DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 454 591 EA 031 065

AUTHOR Howley-Rowe, Caitlin; Leopold, Gregory D.
TITLE Evaluation Report of the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators: 2000 Summer Institute.
INSTITUTION AEL, Inc., Charleston, WV.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 2000-09-00
NOTE 59p.; Document was produced by the CSRD Evaluation Team of the Planning, Research, and Evaluation Unit of AEL, Inc.
CONTRACT RJ96006001
AVAILABLE FROM AEL, Inc., P.O. Box 1348, Charleston, WV 25325-1348. Tel: 800-624-9120 (Toll Free).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Improvement; Elementary Secondary Education; School Effectiveness; School Support
IDENTIFIERS Virginia

ABSTRACT

The Academy for External Facilitators is a significant component of AEL's Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration and is the subject of this report. External facilitators are usually assigned by state departments of education to assist low-performing schools. This report summarizes evaluation of the second summer institute of the Academy for External Facilitators, convened August 2-5, 2000. Forty-seven participants from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia attended the institute. Participants tended to be pleased with the institute and perceived presenters to be competent and their presentations professional and appealing. External facilitators participating in both the 1999 and 2000 institutes showed more skill and knowledge in 2000 with regard to school reform models and strategies, technological abilities, team building, group process, resource identification, the change process, situational analysis, and collaborative leadership. Recommendations included providing participants with more time to interact with presenters, focusing future institutes on areas in which external facilitators report the least expertise, and continuing to offer participants access to Academy resources and events to support ongoing work. There are 14 tables and one figure. Appendices include a Stages of Concern Questionnaire, an External Facilitator Self-Assessment Questionnaire, session evaluation forms, an Overall Institute Evaluation Form, the 2000 Institute Agenda, and the Completed Evaluation Standards Checklist. (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 454 591

Evaluation Report of the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators: 2000 Summer Institute

AEL, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston, West Virginia 25325
800/624-9120

CSRD Evaluation

ER 031065

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation Report of the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators: 2000 Summer Institute

September 2000

Caitlin Howley-Rowe
Gregory D. Leopold
CSRD Evaluation Team
Planning, Research, and Evaluation Unit
AEL, Inc.
P.O. Box 1348 • Charleston, West Virginia 25325
800-624-9120

AEL's mission is to link the knowledge from research with the wisdom from practice to improve teaching and learning. AEL serves as the Regional Educational Laboratory for Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia. For these same four states, it operates both a Regional Technology in Education Consortium and the Eisenhower Regional Consortium for Mathematics and Science Education. In addition, it serves as the Region IV Comprehensive Center and operates the ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools.

Information about AEL projects, programs, and services is available by writing or calling AEL.

Post Office Box 1348
Charleston, West Virginia 25325-1348
304-347-0400
800-624-9120
304-347-0487 (fax)
aelinfo@ael.org
http://www.ael.org

© 2000 by AEL, Inc.

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract number RJ96006001. Its contents do not necessarily reflect the views of OERI, the Department, or any other agency of the U.S. government.

AEL is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer.

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY iv

INTRODUCTION 1
- Federal CSRD Legislation 1
- AEL CSRD Program 1
- Academy for External Facilitators 2
- Goals and Objectives of the 2000 Academy Institute 3
- Audience of and Purpose for This Report 4

METHODS 5
- Evaluation Instruments 5
  - Stages of Concern Questionnaire 5
  - External Facilitator Self-Assessment Instrument 5
  - Four Module Evaluation Instruments 5
  - Overall Institute Evaluation Form 6
  - Review of Institute Materials 6
- Data Collection and Data Analysis 6

FINDINGS 7
- Institute Participants 7
- Facilitating Change in Schools: What Does it Take? 7
- Dimensions of Change in School Reform 9
- Creating Change-Adept Schools 11
- The Role of the District in School Reform 13
- External Facilitator Self-Assessment Instrument 14
- Stages of Concern Questionnaire 18
  - Overall Group Profile 18
  - Dual Peak Analysis 19
  - T Tests of 1999 and 2000 Scores 19
- Overall Institute Evaluation 20

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 24
- Conclusions 24
- Recommendations 25

REFERENCES 26

APPENDIXES

A: Stages of Concern (SoC) Questionnaire
B: External Facilitator Self-Assessment Questionnaire
C: Session Evaluation Forms
D: Overall Institute Evaluation Form
E: 2000 Institute Agenda
F: Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

TABLES

1: Mean Ratings of the Session *Facilitating Change in Schools: What Does it Take?* 8

2: Knowledge Gain and Further Need for Information about External Facilitation 9

3: Mean Ratings of the Session *School Reform: Understanding Dimensions of Change* 10

4: Knowledge Gain and Further Need for Information about Dimensions of Change 11

5: Mean Ratings for the Session *Creating Change-Adept Schools* 12

6: Knowledge Gain and Need for Further Information about Change-Adept Schools 12

7: Mean Ratings for the Session *The Role of the District in School Reform* 13

8: Knowledge Gain and Need for Further Information about the Role of the District in School Reform 14

9: 2000 Self-Assessment Instrument Descriptive Statistics 15

10: *T* Tests of 1999 and 2000 Administrations of the Self-Assessment Instrument 17

11: *T* Tests of 1999 and 2000 Administrations of the Stages of Concern Questionnaire 20

12: Mean Ratings of Overall Institute, Section A 21

13: Mean Ratings of Overall Institute, Section B 22

14: Remaining Responses to Question C3 23

FIGURES

1: Stages of Concern Mean Percentiles, 1999-2000 18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As part of the FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Act (PL 105-78), Congress designated $150 million to promote comprehensive school reform. Much of these Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) funds flowed through states via a competitive grant process to schools and districts, particularly those receiving Title I assistance, interested in implementing schoolwide comprehensive reform. In addition, $4 million was allocated to Regional Educational Laboratories to assist states, districts, and schools in the implementation of the CSRD program.

One significant component of AEL's CSRD program, and the subject of this report, is an Academy for External Facilitators. External facilitators are individuals usually assigned by state departments of education to assist low-performing schools—in this case, those implementing CSRD-funded reform initiatives. The Academy is intended to support the efforts of external facilitators as they begin their work with CSRD-funded schools.

This report summarizes evaluation of the second summer institute of the Academy for External Facilitators, convened August 2-5, 2000, at the Arlie Center in Warrenton, Virginia. Forty-seven participants attended the 2000 institute. Attendance by state is as follows: Kentucky, 5; Tennessee, 14; Virginia, 19; and West Virginia, 9. Participants were individuals selected to serve as external facilitators in schools implementing CSRD reform and various state departments of education staff. In addition, 10 AEL staff were available to facilitate the event.

Participants tended to be pleased with the institute, which they reported provided them with useful information and materials. Presenters were perceived to be competent and their presentations professional and appealing. External facilitators participating in both the 1999 and 2000 institutes were significantly and substantially more skilled and knowledgeable in 2000 with regard to school reform, reform models and strategies, technological abilities, CSRDnet, team building, group process, resource identification, network development, the change process, environmental scanning, and situational analysis. And to a lesser extent, external facilitators were also more skilled and knowledgeable about collaborative leadership.

Overall, attendees at the 2000 institute were less concerned about their roles as external facilitators than they had been the previous year. Although they remained most concerned about their awareness of the innovation and collaboration with others, they also continued to have a high concern for information about external facilitation. External facilitators were least concerned about the consequences or outcomes of their work, as they had been the previous year. Individuals were most concerned with either awareness and information about the innovation, or awareness and collaboration with others.

External facilitators who had participated in the 1999 and 2000 institutes were significantly and substantially less concerned about their awareness of the innovation, information levels, personal issues, and management considerations than they had been in 1999. Their levels of concern about collaboration and refocusing remained fairly stable in 1999 and 2000.

Recommendations included providing participants with more time to interact with presenters, focusing future institutes on areas in which external facilitators report the least expertise, and continuing to offer participants access to Academy resources and events to support their ongoing work.

INTRODUCTION

Federal CSRD Legislation

School improvement is increasingly viewed as an ongoing and comprehensive process. Recent legislation has encouraged the adoption of such a view. In 1994, Congress revised the regulations to allow schools where 50% or more students qualify for free or reduced lunch to use their Title I funds for whole school improvement rather than for programs targeted solely at specific groups of students (American Institutes for Research, 1999). Later, as part of the FY 98 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Act (PL 105-78), and again in 1999, Congress designated $150 million to promote comprehensive school reform. Much of these Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) funds flowed through states via a competitive grant process to schools and districts interested in implementing schoolwide comprehensive reform. Of these monies, $120 million came from Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title I funds allocated by formula to states to allow current Title I schools to adopt comprehensive school reform programs. The Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) allocated $25 million to flow to states by school-age population to allow non-Title I schools to implement comprehensive school reform programs. In addition, $4 million was allocated to Regional Educational Laboratories to assist states, districts, and schools in the implementation of the CSRD program.

According to the New American Schools (NAS) organization (1999), which has developed several of the schoolwide reform models adopted by CSRD-funded schools, "the success or failure of the CSRD Program has enormous implications for public education in the country's poorest neighborhoods." Title I of the ESEA of 1965, which provides federal funding for disadvantaged students, is due for congressional reauthorization in the year 2000. "To encourage research-based and replicable best practices," Congress may reauthorize Title I based upon lessons learned from CSRD (NAS, 1999).

AEL CSRD Program

AEL, Inc. began assisting the four states in its region (Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia) in early 1998 as part of the effort to support state departments of education in their implementation of CSRD. Assistance to these state departments of education has included consultation and technical assistance concerning the development of procedures and criteria to select competitively the schools that would receive assistance under this program. Also, AEL has collaborated with state departments of education in developing procedures for guiding interested districts and schools though the process of assessing their needs, selecting among research-based reform models and strategies, or choosing to develop their own research-based comprehensive program. Also in collaboration with state departments, AEL has developed and provided workshops and technical assistance to schools and districts preparing their applications for grants under this program. Such workshops have included information about candidate reform models, assistance with compiling aggregate components to create a comprehensive program, and guidance on evaluating the effectiveness of programs implemented.

Another facet of AEL's CSRD program has been to assist states and schools in the evaluation of the effectiveness of programs implemented with CSRD funds. Participating CSRD schools are required to evaluate their progress toward the nine CSRD implementation criteria (evaluation itself being one of the nine criteria). AEL CSRD services have additionally included two national research

symposia on the CSRD program and schoolwide reform, and several independent and collaborative research efforts.

Yet another AEL CSRD goal is to develop electronic networks of schools, districts, and external facilitators involved in CSRD. The purpose of such networks is to provide participants with opportunities to share experiences and information, connect with resources, and access relevant information. Moreover, the electronic networks provide AEL a venue for offering ongoing support to CSRD school sites and external facilitators. These networks are also intended to provide AEL with information regarding contributions to successful implementation of CSRD programs for the purpose of informing the wider education community.

AEL has established two types of electronic networks in which staff at CSRD sites, external facilitators, and site researchers assisting with formative evaluation of CSRD schools may participate. CSRDnet is a web-based electronic communication forum providing moderated discussion and conferencing capabilities for external facilitators and CSRD sites. Participants are assigned to several discussion groups based on the comprehensive school reform (CSR) model they are implementing and the state in which they work. A form is provided for participants to enter information about themselves and their undertakings; a similar form is provided for participants to complete profiles of their schools. In addition, a moderator posts articles and links relevant to CSR.

The second electronic medium consists of listservs in three of AEL's four states (Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia). As with CSRDnet, a moderator facilitates discussion and information sharing, and participants include external facilitators and staff members at CSRD sites.

Academy for External Facilitators

Another significant component of AEL's CSRD program, and the subject of this report, is an Academy for External Facilitators. External facilitators are individuals usually assigned by state departments of education to assist low-performing schools—in this case, those implementing CSRD-funded reform initiatives. The use of external facilitators in such a role may have implications for the structure of future assistance to low-performing schools.

AEL's Academy offers training and support as external facilitators execute five challenging roles in school reform: using the knowledge base on effective practices leading to improved student performance; modeling collaboration and joint problem-solving; collecting, organizing, and analyzing school data to make decisions; brokering and recommending resources; and acting as agents of change in contexts in which facilitators possess no authority to direct change.

The Academy is based on an action research learn-as-you-practice model. AEL convened a team of national experts in school change to design the Academy and its sessions. After an initial 5-day residential institute in 1999, Academy participants were electronically networked to gain information and support as they worked at school sites. Participants honed their skills further at subsequent meetings to share their experiences and receive further training. The phases of the Academy are briefly described below.

Phase I: Phase I consisted of a 1-day introductory state department meeting for each state in AEL's region during which participants gathered to discuss state-specific issues and Academy orientation. The second part of Phase I was a 6-day residential institute in August 1999 during which

participants attended sessions conducted by national experts on such topics as whole-school reform, the change process, formative evaluation, making informed decisions based on data, and organizational leadership and development.

Phase II: Phase II provided support to external facilitators participating in the Academy as they worked at their sites. Phase II linked participants through technology—moderated listservs, conferencing areas, and chat rooms with facilitated conversations. External facilitators at sites in each state were connected to receive both general and state-specific information on resources, issues of concern, and strategies for change. In addition, sites were connected via electronic forums across states according to selected models.

Phase III: Phase III consisted of follow-up state meetings for participants, who attended at least one 1-day meeting for reflection and assessment of progress.

Phase IV: Phase IV consisted of a second residential institute. Participants from the first cohort attended a meeting that coincided with the first residential institute of the next cohort of external facilitators. Second-year attendees received follow-up training and shared expertise among themselves and new participants. This report summarizes evaluation data from the Phase IV residential institute convened August 2-5, 2000, at the Arlie Center in Warrenton, Virginia.

Goals and Objectives of the 2000 Academy Institute

The goals of the second Academy institute were to help participants

- broaden their understanding of school reform and the change process
- increase their repertoire of strategies for helping schools build capacity for continuous improvement
- inform their state's future reform efforts through the distillation of lessons learned
- expand their resource networks

In addition, AEL staff outlined daily objectives for the institute. These were to

- clarify the purpose and scope of the 2000 summer institute (Wednesday, August 2)
- capture lessons learned from the first year of CSRD implementation (Wednesday, August 2)
- expand understanding of how change is planned, managed, and implemented (Thursday, August 3)
- foster broad awareness of the policy and practice connection in states (Thursday, August 3)
- increase capacity to work more effectively with model developers and others providing services to schools (Friday, August 4)
- expand knowledge and skills of external facilitation for comprehensive school reform (Friday, August 4)
- provide an opportunity for states to reflect on Year 1 and plan for Year 2 (Saturday, August 5)
- celebrate and acknowledge contributions of external facilitators (Saturday, August 5)

Audience of and Purpose for This Report

This report is intended for AEL CSRD staff involved in leading the Academy and the AEL Corporate Leadership Group. Others who might find this report of use include the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, from whom AEL receives funding, and other education researchers and practitioners interested in comprehensive school reform or external facilitation.

The purpose of this report is to provide AEL CSRD staff with information about the strengths and weaknesses of the 2000 Academy institute so that they may make any needed changes in future Academy events. Specifically, participants were asked to complete evaluation forms about their satisfaction with various characteristics of several presentations and the institute overall. This report will also describe any changes between 1999 and 2000 in participants' self-assessments of their external facilitation skills and the types of concerns that they have about their role. Finally, the degree to which the institute met its goals will be assessed.

METHODS

Overall, the evaluation assessed participants' satisfaction with various characteristics of four institute sessions, satisfaction with the entire institute, concerns about external facilitation as an innovation, and skills and knowledge associated with the role of external facilitator. To these ends, four types of questionnaires were administered during the 2000 institute, and are described below. It should be noted that although interviews and participant observation would have added depth and richness to the evaluation, such strategies were not considered cost effective during this year's institute.

Evaluation Instruments

Stages of Concern Questionnaire. The Stages of Concern (SoC) Questionnaire (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1986) is an instrument that measures seven identified stages of concern that respondents experience as they progress through a change effort (see Appendix A). Developed by the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) researchers, the SoC questionnaire is a 35-item, paper-and-pencil survey instrument. Each of 35 stimulus statements solicits a response on a 7-point Likert scale. Responses along the 7-point scale indicate a respondent's degree of concern about the stimulus statement. The lowest response option on the scale is (0) for *irrelevant*, while the highest response is (7) for *very true of me now*. The 35 stimulus statements are generic to any innovation and therefore can be applied to, in this case, the role of external facilitator. The text in the cover page of the instrument states the specific name of the innovation to which the generic stimulus statements refer and directs the respondents to keep only that innovation in mind when completing the instrument. The SoC Questionnaire was administered to participants at the beginning of the 1999 summer institute, and again at the end of the 2000 institute.

External Facilitator Self-Assessment Instrument. This instrument was developed by AEL evaluators to assess the baseline skills and knowledge of the participants regarding the specific skills associated with the role of external facilitator (see Appendix B). The instrument was first administered at the beginning of the 1999 summer institute; it was readministered at the close of the 2000 event.

Four Module Evaluation Instruments. Four instruments (see Appendix C) were developed by AEL evaluators to assess the extent to which participants were satisfied with characteristics of four sessions presented during the institute and the degree to which the sessions met their goals. Each instrument solicited responses to 17 items about sessions via a 5-point Likert-type scale, with anchor points of 1=not at all and 5=very much. Participants were also requested to rate the level of knowledge they gained from each session and the extent to which they continued to need further information. Response options ranged from 1=none or not at all to 5=very much or a lot.

- *The Change-Adept Schools Instrument* was specifically designed to measure participants' opinions of the session on nurturing change-adept schools presented by Philip Schlechty

- *The Dimensions of Change Instrument* was specifically designed to measure participants' opinions of the session on dimensions of change presented by Andy Hargreaves

- *The Role of the District in School Reform Instrument* was specifically designed to measure participants' opinions of the session on the role of the local school district in school reform presented by Dale Kalkofen

- *The Facilitating Change in Schools Instrument* was specifically designed to measure participants' opinions of the session on facilitating change in schools presented by Ben Perez

Overall Institute Evaluation Form. This instrument was developed by AEL evaluators to assess participants' overall impressions of the summer institute and the degree which they thought institute goals and objectives had been met (see Appendix D).

Review of Institute Materials. In addition to designing and analyzing evaluation instruments, the evaluator also reviewed the institute agenda and other materials distributed at the event for alignment with presentations, quality of the information, and utility to participants. The institute agenda is available in Appendix E.

Data Collection and Data Analysis

Instruments were administered in a group setting by AEL staff. The SoC Questionnaire and the self-assessment instruments were administered at the beginning of the institute. Session evaluation forms were administered immediately after the sessions were completed. The overall institute evaluation form was administered at the conclusion of the institute.

All data analyses were conducted by AEL evaluators. Quantitative data analyses were completed using SPSS for Windows and a custom AEL analysis program for the SoC instrument. Descriptive statistics were calculated for each of the instruments. Tests of statistical significance and effect sizes were calculated for pre- and posttest administrations of the SoC and self-assessment instruments. Coefficient alpha (a measure of internal consistency reliability) was also calculated for each instrument.

FINDINGS

Institute Participants

Forty-seven participants attended the 2000 institute of the Academy for External facilitators. Attendance by state is as follows: Kentucky, 5; Tennessee, 14; Virginia, 19; and West Virginia, 9. Participants were individuals selected to serve as external facilitators in schools implementing CSRD reform and various state departments of education staff. In addition, 10 AEL staff were available to facilitate the event.

Thirty-seven attendees completed a brief demographic questionnaire attached to the final evaluation form at the end of the institute. Nearly half of the respondents (48%) did not reply when asked to describe their primary role or affiliation. Twenty percent explicitly noted that they worked for a state department of education, and 17% described themselves as external facilitators. Three percent each responded that they were education consultants or staff of the Virginia Governor's Best Practice Centers. The remaining 10% gave specific titles, but did not attribute these to any particular organizational affiliation.

Thirty-seven attendees replied when asked about their full- or part-time employment status. Of these, about half (51%) worked full-time. Of the 23 respondents replying to a query about the grade levels they supervised or administered, 78% chose the option representing preK-12. PreK-8 was selected by 4%, preK-6 by 13%, and the "other" option by 4%. Asked about the urbanicity or rurality of the schools in which they worked, more than half (54%) of the 35 respondents reported involvement with rural schools. Only 3% worked in suburban locales, while 11% were in urban schools. Slightly less than a third (31%) said they worked in more than one setting.

The mean years respondents had worked in education was 29.75 (standard deviation [SD] of 7.49). Years in education ranged from 12 for one respondent to 44 for another. The majority of the 37 respondents to the demographic items were women (76%); the mean age of the 35 participants replying was 54 (SD 7.61), with ages ranging from 37 to 69. Thirty-seven respondents replied when asked for information about their education levels. Respondents were highly educated, with 97% having at least a master's degree. Somewhat less than a third of the total respondents (27%) had earned a doctorate degree.

Facilitating Change in Schools: What Does it Take?

Thirty-seven participants completed the evaluation form about the session on facilitating change in schools. This instrument had a coefficient alpha of $r = .91$, indicating a high level of consistency among items. With mean ratings of satisfaction ranging from 4.94 to 4.62 on the 5-point scale, this session appears to have been quite well-received. The two highest mean ratings were given for the professional (4.94, SD 0.23) and appealing (4.92, SD 0.28) manner in which the session was presented and for the competence of the presenter (4.92, SD 0.28). The small standard deviations suggest that respondents were in close agreement about these characteristics.

The extent to which the presentation increased communication and collegiality with others received the lowest mean rating (4.62, SD 0.72). Also less well rated was the degree to which the session was relevant to participants' needs (4.67, SD 0.48). Nonetheless, these scores are very high

on the 5-point scale. Additional descriptive statistics for this section of the form are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Mean Ratings of the Session *Facilitating Change in Schools: What Does it Take?*

Item: Extent to which the session . . .	N	Mean	*SD*
1. Had clear outcomes	36	4.69	0.58
2. Included clear directions for activities	36	4.69	0.67
3. Facilitated development of new skills	37	4.68	0.53
4. Was conducted in an appealing manner	37	4.92	0.28
5. Was conducted in a professional manner	36	4.94	0.23
6. Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	37	4.92	0.28
7. Had activities that were well sequenced	37	4.73	0.45
8. Had activities that reinforced content	37	4.73	0.45
9. Included appropriate examples	37	4.81	0.46
10. Was relevant to my needs	36	4.67	0.48
11. Had meaningful involvement of participants	37	4.78	0.53
12. Caused me to reflect on my practices	37	4.78	0.42
13. Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	37	4.76	0.44
14. Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	37	4.76	0.44
15. Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	37	4.68	0.48
16. Increased communication and collegiality with others	37	4.62	0.72
17. Increased my understanding of what it takes to facilitate change in schools	37	4.70	0.52

Respondents were also asked to rate the amount of knowledge they had gained during the session about external facilitation and about external facilitation skills that could be added to their repertoire. Then, respondents were requested to rate their level of need for further information regarding the topics.

Respondents indicated that they had gained much knowledge about external facilitation of CSRD (4.69, SD 0.53) and that they had expanded their repertoire of external facilitation skills (4.72, SD 0.51). However, respondents also reported continuing to have a moderate need for information

about both, with a mean of 3.69 (SD 1.00) for knowledge of external facilitation and a mean of 3.79 (SD 0.94) for external facilitation skills. See Table 2 for descriptive statistics.

Table 2
Knowledge Gain and Further Need for Information about External Facilitation

Item	Knowledge Gain			Further Need		
	N	Mean	*SD*	N	Mean	*SD*
18. Expanded my knowledge of external facilitation for comprehensive school reform	36	4.69	0.53	29	3.69	1.00
19. Expanded my repertoire of external facilitation skills for comprehensive school reform	36	4.72	0.51	29	3.79	0.94

Overall, this presentation was quite well-received by respondents. Even the lowest rated items were relatively high on the 5-point scale. Although participants reported having a moderate need for further information, this was not an overwhelming concern.

Dimensions of Change in School Reform

Forty-eight respondents replied to the evaluation form for the session about dimensions of change in school reform. (It is unclear why 48 evaluation forms were completed when only 47 individuals were counted as participants.) This instrument had a coefficient alpha of $r = .93$, revealing a high level of consistency among items. The highest rating was given for the competence of the presenter, with a mean of 4.96 (SD 0.20). Also highly rated was the professional manner in which the session was presented (4.83, SD 0.38). Least well-rated was the extent to which the presentation increased communication and collegiality among participants, with a mean of 4.28 (SD 0.78). With a mean of 4.43 (SD 0.74), the degree to which the session included meaningful involvement of participants was the second lowest rated item. See table 3 for further detail.

Respondents were also asked to rate the amount of knowledge they had gained during the session about dimensions of change, particularly in terms of the degree to which the session expanded their understanding of how change is planned, managed, and implemented. Then, respondents were requested to rate their level of need for further information regarding the topic.

Although respondents reported that they had gained much knowledge about how change is planned, managed, and implemented (4.55, SD 0.62), they nonetheless also reported a fairly significant need for further information (4.42, SD 0.63). Descriptive statistics are shown in Table 4.

Overall, this session was received very well by respondents, who thought it was presented in a professional manner by a competent presenter. Although the presentation did not necessarily engage participants in activities that enhanced communication and collegiality, this did not appear to lessen respondents' regard for the session. Respondents learned much about dimensions of change but continued to have need for more information.

Table 3
Mean Ratings of the Session *School Reform: Understanding Dimensions of Change*

Item: Extent to which the session . . .	N	Mean	*SD*
1. Had clear outcomes	48	4.67	0.56
2. Included clear directions for activities	47	4.58	0.58
3. Facilitated development of new skills	47	4.53	0.62
4. Was conducted in an appealing manner	48	4.75	0.57
5. Was conducted in a professional manner	48	4.83	0.38
6. Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	48	4.96	0.20
7. Had activities that were well sequenced	48	4.65	0.57
8. Had activities that reinforced content	46	4.52	0.66
9. Included appropriate examples	48	4.69	0.51
10. Was relevant to my needs	48	4.79	0.41
11. Had meaningful involvement of participants	47	4.43	0.74
12. Caused me to reflect on my practices	48	4.75	0.48
13. Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	48	4.71	0.50
14. Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	48	4.63	0.67
15. Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	47	4.60	0.74
16. Increased communication and collegiality with others	46	4.28	0.78
17. Increased my understanding of the dimensions of change	48	4.75	0.44

Table 4
Knowledge Gain and Further Need for Information about Dimensions of Change

Item	Knowledge Gain			Further Need		
	N	Mean	*SD*	N	Mean	*SD*
18. Expanded my understanding of how change is planned, managed, and implemented	47	4.55	0.62	41	4.42	0.63

Creating Change-Adept Schools

A total of 37 participants completed the evaluation form for the session about creating change-adept schools. With a coefficient alpha of $r = .90$, this instrument possesses sufficient internal reliability. Receiving the highest mean rating was the extent to which the session was conducted by competent presenters (4.89, SD 0.32). Also highly rated was the degree to which (1) the presentation increased respondents' understanding of how to create change-adept schools (4.84 (SD 0.44) and (2) caused respondents to reflect on their practice (4.84, SD 0.37). See Table 5 for further detail.

The degree to which the session had meaningful involvement of participants, however, received the lowest mean rating of 3.97 (SD 1.30). The large standard deviation suggests that there was some disagreement among respondents about this issue. Receiving the second lowest mean rating was the extent to which the presentation encouraged communication and collegiality with other participants (4.03, SD 1.33). Again, the large standard deviation indicates that this view was not consistent among respondents. The extent to which the session included clear directions for activities had the largest standard deviation of 1.49, suggesting that directions were clear to some participants but not to others.

Respondents were also asked to rate the amount of knowledge they had gained during the session about creating change-adept schools. Then, respondents were requested to rate their level of need for further information regarding the topic.

Those completing the evaluation form indicated a large increase in their understanding of the topic, with a mean rating of 4.67 (SD 0.63) for their knowledge gain. Nonetheless, respondents also reported a fairly substantial need for further information about how to create schools adept at undertaking and sustaining change (4.55, SD 0.62). Descriptive statistics for this section of the instrument are presented in Table 6.

Overall, as with other sessions, respondents reported that this session was quite satisfactory. They thought the presentation was given by a competent presenter and that their understanding of how to create change-adept schools had been increased. Nonetheless, respondents also reported a continuing need for information on the topic.

Table 5
Mean Ratings for the Session *Creating Change-Adept Schools*

Item: Extent to which the session . . .	N	Mean	*SD*
1. Had clear outcomes	37	4.60	0.87
2. Included clear directions for activities	27	4.07	1.49
3. Facilitated development of new skills	35	4.63	0.77
4. Was conducted in an appealing manner	37	4.70	0.57
5. Was conducted in a professional manner	37	4.76	0.55
6. Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	37	4.89	0.32
7. Had activities that were well sequenced	32	4.28	1.11
8. Had activities that reinforced content	31	4.16	1.29
9. Included appropriate examples	37	4.62	0.83
10. Was relevant to my needs	36	4.72	0.57
11. Had meaningful involvement of participants	35	3.97	1.30
12. Caused me to reflect on my practices	37	4.84	0.37
13. Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	37	4.73	0.45
14. Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	37	4.76	0.50
15. Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	33	4.09	1.31
16. Increased communication and collegiality with others	33	4.03	1.33
17. Increased my understanding of how to create change-adept schools	37	4.84	0.44

Table 6
Knowledge Gain and Need for Further Information about Change-Adept Schools

Item	Knowledge Gain			Further Need		
	N	Mean	*SD*	N	Mean	*SD*
18. Gained knowledge about the creation of change-adept schools	36	4.67	0.63	33	4.55	0.62

The Role of the District in School Reform

Fifteen respondents replied to the evaluation form for the session on the role of the school district in reform (see Table 7). Other sessions were scheduled at the same time as this session; the number of respondents is therefore smaller than the number for sessions scheduled alone. The evaluation instrument for this session had a coefficient alpha of $r = .97$, indicating very high consistency among items. Competence of the presenter (4.73, SD 0.46) and the professional manner in which the session was presented (4.67, SD 0.48) received the highest mean ratings. The lowest ratings were the extent to which the presentation had meaningful involvement of participants (4.00, SD 1.18) and had well-sequenced activities (4.00, SD 0.76). Some items had relatively large standard deviations, suggesting that respondents were not congruent in their appraisals of the session.

Table 7
Mean Ratings for the Session *The Role of the District in School Reform*

Item: Extent to which the session . . .	N	Mean	*SD*
1. Had clear outcomes	15	4.53	0.64
2. Included clear directions for activities	13	4.15	0.80
3. Facilitated development of new skills	14	4.21	0.80
4. Was conducted in an appealing manner	15	4.33	0.72
5. Was conducted in a professional manner	15	4.67	0.48
6. Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	15	4.73	0.46
7. Had activities that were well sequenced	15	4.00	0.76
8. Had activities that reinforced content	15	4.07	1.10
9. Included appropriate examples	15	4.53	0.64
10. Was relevant to my needs	15	4.40	0.74
11. Had meaningful involvement of participants	14	4.00	1.18
12. Caused me to reflect on my practices	15	4.40	1.06
13. Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	15	4.13	1.13
14. Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	15	4.13	1.25
15. Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	15	4.40	0.91
16. Increased communication and collegiality with others	14	4.21	1.18
17. Increased my understanding of the role of the district in school reform	15	4.47	0.83

Table 8
Knowledge Gain and Need for Further Information about the Role of the District in School Reform

Item	Knowledge Gain			Further Need		
	N	Mean	*SD*	N	Mean	*SD*
18. Enhanced my knowledge of the role of the district in school reform	15	4.27	0.88	14	3.93	1.14
19. Increased my capacity to work with district staff	14	4.21	0.89	13	4.00	1.16

Respondents were also asked to rate the amount of knowledge they had gained during the session about the role of the district in school reform and about increasing their capacity to work with district staff. Then, respondents were requested to rate their level of need for further information regarding the topics.

Participants reported gaining much knowledge about the role of the school district in reform (4.27, SD 0.88) and an enhanced capacity to work with district staff (4.21, SD 0.89). Yet they also indicated a need for further information about both issues, with means of 3.93 (SD 1.14) and 4.00 (SD 1.16). The relatively large standard deviations suggest that respondents were not in complete agreement about their continuing need for such information, however. These statistics are shown in Table 8.

In sum, this session was well-received by respondents. They perceived that the presentation was given by a competent presenter in a professional manner. And participants gained knowledge about the role of the school district in reform, and increased their capacity to work with school districts, although they had a moderate need for further information about the issues.

External Facilitator Self-Assessment Instrument

Participants were asked to rate their level of skill and knowledge with regard to 20 roles or areas of expertise associated with external facilitation. Participants used a scale of 1-10, with 1 indicating *limited skills and knowledge* and 10 indicating *exceptional skills and knowledge*. The instrument had a coefficient alpha of $r = .97$, indicating high internal consistency among the items.

Twenty-eight Academy participants completed the Self-Assessment Instrument at the 2000 institute. Mean ratings for the 20 items ranged from 5.56 to 7.79 on the 10-point scale (SDs ranged from 1.31 to 2.61), suggesting that participants tended to think they possessed moderate levels of skill and knowledge about each area associated with the role of external facilitator. See Table 9 for further detail.

Overall, respondents reported being most skillful and knowledgeable in the areas of collaborative leadership, the change process, school reform, decision making, listening, and communicating. Participants thought they possessed approximately average levels of skill and knowledge in terms of CSRDnet and technology, although these areas received the lowest mean

ratings. Diversity also appears to be an area of some concern for respondents, though this topic too received ratings above scale midpoint.

Table 9
2000 Self-Assessment Descriptive Statistics

Items in Mean Rank Order	N	Mean	*SD*
1. CSRDnet	27	5.56	2.61
2. Technological abilities	28	5.96	1.92
3. Diversity	28	6.39	1.69
4. Reform models and strategies	28	6.71	1.61
5. Data interpretation	28	6.79	1.83
6. Environmental scanning	27	6.82	1.86
7. Network development	28	6.82	1.92
8. Standards, assessment, and testing	28	6.89	1.83
9. Resource identification	28	6.96	1.55
10. Group process	28	7.04	1.64
11. Formative evaluation	28	7.07	1.80
12. Data collection	28	7.11	1.85
13. Team building	28	7.11	1.60
14. Situational analysis	28	7.18	1.61
15. Communications	28	7.36	1.47
16. Listening	28	7.43	1.87
17. Decision making	28	7.43	1.35
18. School reform	28	7.68	1.31
19. The change process	28	7.75	1.60
20. Collaborative leadership	28	7.79	1.55

Paired sample *t* tests were calculated to discern any statistically significant differences—that is, differences not likely due to chance or sampling error—in the skill and knowledge level of participants in attendance at both the 1999 and 2000 Academy institutes. In other words, *t* tests were run only on scores of those external facilitators who had participated in both the 1999 and 2000 institutes (N=15); others were excluded from the analysis.

It should be noted that the assumptions of the *t* test were violated in this study. The sample was not random, nor was it assumed that the data were drawn from a normally distributed population. Phillips (1982) contends, however, that "since those assumptions now appear to be far less important than originally thought, the recent trend toward increasing use of distribution-free tests is currently being reversed" (p. 139). Likewise, Glass and Hopkins (1984) report research suggesting that violation of the assumptions of normality and homogeneity of variance has little impact upon the robustness of *t* tests. For these reasons, the evaluator chose to use the *t* test to explore the statistical significance of pre- and posttest differences on the Self-Assessment Instrument.

Twelve statistically significant increases and no statistically significant decreases were located at the .05 level of significance. Increases were found in ratings of respondents' levels of skill and knowledge about school reform, reform models and strategies, technological abilities, CSRDnet, team building, group process, collaborative leadership, resource identification, network development, the change process, environmental scanning, and situational analysis. *T* test statistics are presented in Table 10.

Statistical significance alone, however, does not indicate the meaningfulness of findings; rather, it indicates the rareness of findings. The calculation of effect size allows the conversion of statistically significant results into the standard deviation metric, providing a better analysis of practical significance. Thus, effect sizea were calculated to estimate the practical significance of the pre- and posttest scores expressed in standard deviation units.

Effect sizes for statistically significant increases were quite large, according to the conventions established by Cohen (1988). The smallest effect size was $d = .49$, representing a moderate increase in respondents' levels of skill and knowledge with regard to collaborative leadership. The remaining effect sizes, ranging from $d = .78$ to $d = 3.12$, were large, suggesting substantial growth in external facilitators' perceptions of their skills and knowledge.

To conclude, increases in respondents' ratings of their skill and knowledge levels on 12 of the 20 items were likely not due to chance. Moreover, such increases were large. Growth in external facilitators' knowledge and skills, then, is both substantial and not likely due to chance. Because such change is dramatic and statistically significant, it appears that participation in the External Facilitators Academy enhanced external facilitators' skills and knowledge in important ways.

Table 10
***T* Tests of 1999 and 2000 Administrations of the Self-Assessment Instrument**

Self-Assessment Item	Year	N	Mean	SD	*t*	Sig.	*d*
School reform	1999 2000	15 15	6.40 7.73	1.35 .80	4.000	.001*	.99
Reform models and strategies	1999 2000	15 15	4.80 6.73	2.08 1.39	3.532	.003*	.93
Technological abilities	1999 2000	15 15	4.73 6.13	1.79 1.64	2.881	.012*	.78
CSRDnet	1999 2000	15 15	1.47 5.00	1.13 2.07	6.739	.000*	3.12
Team building	1999 2000	15 15	5.60 7.07	1.55 1.22	3.659	.003*	.95
Group process	1999 2000	15 15	5.80 7.20	1.74 1.32	3.400	.004*	.80
Diversity	1999 2000	15 15	5.53 6.00	2.20 1.31	1.023	.324	n/a
Communications	1999 2000	15 15	7.07 7.20	1.62 .94	.299	.769	n/a
Listening	1999 2000	15 15	7.40 7.53	1.64 1.46	.307	.764	n/a
Collaborative leadership	1999 2000	15 15	6.93 7.73	1.62 1.39	2.449	.028*	.49
Formative evaluation	1999 2000	15 15	6.13 7.00	1.81 1.41	1.407	.181	n/a
Data collection	1999 2000	15 15	6.80 7.27	1.78 1.39	.940	.363	n/a
Data interpretation	1999 2000	15 15	7.07 6.93	1.79 1.53	-.222	.827	n/a
Standards, assessment and testing	1999 2000	15 15	6.33 7.00	1.45 1.65	1.784	.096	n/a
Resource identification	1999 2000	15 15	5.00 6.93	1.89 .96	4.740	.000*	1.02
Network development	1999 2000	15 15	4.60 6.73	2.61 1.67	2.673	.018*	.82
The change process	1999 2000	15 15	6.20 7.87	1.42 1.06	5.000	.000*	1.18
Environmental scanning	1999 2000	14 14	4.14 6.57	2.63 1.02	3.631	.003*	.92
Situational analysis	1999 2000	15 15	4.07 7.13	2.05 1.30	5.890	.000*	1.49
Decision making	1999 2000	14 14	6.79 7.43	2.19 .94	1.422	.179	n/a

* Statistically significant at the .05 level.

Stages of Concern Questionnaire

The Stages of Concern (SoC) Questionnaire was given near the end of the institute. According to the instrument developers, a concern is "the composite representation of the feelings, preoccupation, thought, and consideration given to a particular issue or task" (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1977, p. 5). SoC data are intended for use by personnel involved in the adoption of an innovation for diagnostic purposes. As with many instruments, interpretations of SoC data should be treated as hypotheses and confirmed with respondents to maximize the usefulness of the questionnaire.

Three types of analyses were conducted of the SoC data. First, an overall group profile was obtained for those completing the instrument at the 2000 institute. Second, percentile scores for each participant were obtained, and a dual peak analysis was conducted. Third, individual profiles for each participant were generated, and paired sample *t* tests were conducted to determine the presence of any statistically significant changes in external facilitators' concerns between 1999 and 2000. A total of 37 participants in the 2000 institute completed the survey.

Overall Group Profile. The profile interpretations presented below are guided by the SoC technical manual (Hall, George, & Rutherford, 1977). As seen in Figure 1, the highest peak of concern in 2000 was at the Awareness level (Stage 0). Although Stage 0 scores are not generally interpreted in a group profile, the instrument developers contend that, for users of an innovation, scores above the 60th percentile suggest two alternative phenomena: respondents are either unconcerned with the innovation, focusing their attention on other work, or they have achieved a high level of comfort with it. External facilitators may also continue to struggle with the meaning of their work, as CSRD is as yet a relatively new program and their role an evolving one. Moreover, respondents perhaps continue to require a definition of the significance of the Academy to their work.

Figure 1
Stages of Concern Mean Percentiles, 1999-2000

The second highest peak for the 2000 group is at Stage 5, Collaboration. This suggests that respondents are either genuinely interested in working together with others in an effort to enhance the innovation or are more interested in receiving ideas for their work from others.

It is also notable that the lowest level of concern was at Stage 4, Consequence. This suggests that respondents have the least amount of concern with the consequences, or outcomes of, the innovation. Also of interest is that 1999 and 2000 group profiles do not appear significantly different. Although external facilitators are less concerned overall in 2000, the group profiles for both administration years reveal strikingly similar patterns of concern. Put another way, the group has not progressed through any of the developmental stages of concern, but overall their levels of concern are less intense.

Dual Peak Analysis. The first and second highest percentile scores were obtained from each participant's profile. This is one type of analysis suggested by the instrument's developers.

As noted earlier, Stage 0 (Awareness) scores are conventionally not included in analyses of the SoC when administered to users of an innovation. They are nonetheless presented in this report because, although Hall, George, and Rutherford (1977) maintain that high Stage 0 scores are generally accompanied by low Stage 1 and 2 scores, this is not the case for the 2000 SoC respondents. In addition, it may be important not to overlook the preponderance of Stage 0 peaks.

Across all individual profiles, the most frequent high peak was at Stage 0. Eighteen of the 37 respondents were most concerned with their awareness of the Academy (of these, one had an identical high score for Stage 1, Information). This corroborates the findings presented earlier that participants continued to have relatively high needs for information about the topics covered in the four sessions that were evaluated. The second most frequent high peak was at Stage 5 (Collaboration), with 14 respondents reporting the greatest amount of concern with collaborating with others (one of these had an identical high score for Stage 1).

The most frequent second highest score was at Stage 0, with 12 respondents feeling some concern about their awareness of the innovation. For 11 respondents, Stage 1, Information, was the second highest area of concern.

Stage 0 received either the first or second highest score from 29 of the 37 respondents (including one individual with identical peaks). Stage 5, Collaboration, received either the first or second highest score from 22 respondents (including one individual with identically scored peaks).

Combinations of first and second high scores were also analyzed. The most frequent combination was of Stage 0 (Awareness) and Stage 5 (Collaboration). The next most frequent combination was of Stage 0 and Stage 1 (Information).

In sum, it appears that many external facilitators continue to be focused on their awareness of the role of the external facilitator. In addition, many also appear concerned with collaborating with others; it is unclear, however, whether such concern is to improve the innovation and its effectiveness or to gain new ideas and strategies from others.

***T* Tests of 1999 and 2000 Scores.** Paired sample *t* tests were conducted to determine if changes in levels of concern between the 1999 and 2000 administrations of the SoC instrument were statistically significant (see Table 11). Decreases in mean raw scores for five stages of concern were found to be statistically significant at the .05 level. Hence, the diminishment in respondents' concern about awareness, information, personal, management, and consequence issues is likely not due to chance alone.

Cohen's *d* was also calculated to determine the practical meaningfulness of statistically significant findings. With effect sizes ranging from $d = 1.26$ to $d = 1.73$, decreases in respondents' levels of concern about awareness, information, personal, and management issues were substantial. However, with $d = 0.35$, decreases in scores for Stage 4 (Consequence) were small.

In sum, it appears that external facilitators who had participated in the 1999 and 2000 institutes were significantly and substantially less concerned about their awareness of the innovation, information levels, personal issues, and management considerations, and significantly and somewhat less concerned about consequences. Their levels of concern about collaboration and refocusing remained fairly stable in 1999 and 2000.

Table 11
***T* Tests of 1999 and 2000 Administrations of the Stages of Concerns Questionnaire**

Stage of Concern	Year	N	Mean	SD	*t*	Sig.	*d*
Stage 0 (Awareness)	1999 2000	21 21	16.19 9.43	5.35 4.85	3.686	.001*	1.26
Stage 1 (Information)	1999 2000	21 21	22.71 12.00	7.38 7.29	5.798	.000*	1.45
Stage 2 (Personal)	1999 2000	21 21	20.29 10.67	5.56 7.70	4.990	.000*	1.73
Stage 3 (Management)	1999 2000	37 37	41.51 11.41	23.61 6.02	10.395	.000*	1.27
Stage 4 (Consequence)	1999 2000	37 37	20.92 13.70	20.61 8.92	3.426	.002*	0.35
Stage 5 (Collaboration)	1999 2000	21 21	26.19 22.67	8.90 10.70	1.758	.094	n/a
Stage 6 (Refocusing)	1999 2000	21 21	16.71 15.67	7.73 8.39	0.541	.594	n/a

* Statistically significant at the .05 level.

Overall Institute Evaluation

Thirty-five participants completed and returned the final evaluation form concerning the entire institute. Section A of the evaluation form asked respondents to reply to items related to various logistical aspects of the institute. Section B asked respondents to rate the extent to which various institute objectives were met. Anchor points for items in these two sections ranged from 1=never or not at all to 5=always or very. Finally, Section C provided three open-ended prompts for respondents

to complete concerning the high point of the event, suggestions for improvement, and any remaining concerns. This instrument possesses relatively high internal consistency among quantitative items, with a coefficient alpha of $r = .86$.

As presented in Table 12, mean ratings in response to items in Section A of the evaluation form were quite high on the 5-point scale, ranging from a low of 4.43 (SD 0.74) in terms of the extent to which AEL carried out planned activities at their scheduled times to a high of 4.97 (SD 0.17) with regard to the responsiveness of AEL staff and presenters to requests for service or assistance. These mean ratings, along with the relatively small standard deviations, suggest that respondents tended to be in agreement about their high level of satisfaction with the knowledge, skills, and responsiveness of AEL staff; the usefulness of materials and the overall institute to their ongoing work; and the location, format, and meeting facilities of the institute.

Table 12
Mean Ratings of Overall Institute, Section A

Item	N	Mean	SD
1. Did AEL carry out planned activities at the times scheduled?	35	4.43	0.74
2. How responsive were AEL staff and/or presenters to your requests for service and/or assistance during the Institute?	35	4.97	0.17
3. How knowledgeable were AEL staff and/or presenters?	35	4.91	0.28
4. How skilled were AEL staff and/or presenters in completing their tasks?	35	4.91	0.28
5. How well were your information needs met at this Institute?	35	4.74	0.51
6. How useful were the materials provided to you during this Institute?	35	4.77	0.43
7. How satisfied were you with the location of this event?	35	4.91	0.28
8. How satisfied were you with the format of this Institute?	35	4.60	0.60
9. How satisfied were you with the meeting facilities at this event?	35	4.83	0.51
10. How useful do you anticipate this Institute will be to your work?	35	4.83	0.38

Mean ratings in reply to Section B items were similarly high on the 5-point scale (see Table 13). The highest mean rating was given in response to the item concerning respondents' broadened understanding of school reform and the change process (4.83, SD 0.38). Also highly rated was the extent to which the institute increased respondents' repertoire of strategies to help schools build their capacity for continuous improvement, with a mean of 4.77 (SD 0.42).

Receiving the lowest mean rating was the extent to which respondents informed their states' future reform efforts through sharing lessons learned (4.00, SD 0.90). The item receiving the next lowest rating of 4.17 (SD 0.87) concerned the usefulness of the opportunity for respondents to plan for Year 2 with their state colleagues.

In sum, mean ratings on this section of the overall evaluation form indicate that institute objectives were met well. Even the lowest rated item is relatively high on the 5-point scale.

Table 13
Mean Ratings of Overall Institute, Section B

Item	N	Mean	SD
1. To what extent did the Institute broaden your understanding of school reform and the change process?	35	4.83	0.38
2. To what extent did you increase your repertoire of strategies for helping schools build their capacity for continuous improvement?	35	4.77	0.42
3. To what extent did you assist to inform your state's future reform efforts through sharing lessons learned?	33	4.00	0.90
4. To what extent were you able to expand your resource network?	33	4.58	0.56
5. To what extent did you acquire an expanded understanding of how change is planned, managed, and implemented?	33	4.58	0.61
6. To what extent was your awareness of the connection between policy and practice in states broadened?	33	4.24	0.71
7. To what extent did you develop new collegial relationships?	33	4.49	0.67
8. To what extent did you learn from other participants?	33	4.46	0.62
9. To what extent do you feel better prepared to work effectively with model developers and others providing services to schools?	33	4.27	0.67
10. To what extent were your external facilitation skills augmented?	33	4.64	0.60
11. To what extent was your knowledge of external facilitation enhanced?	33	4.58	0.61
12. To what extent was the opportunity to reflect on Year 1 with your state colleagues useful?	30	4.40	0.93
13. To what extent was the opportunity to plan for Year 2 with your state colleagues useful?	30	4.17	0.87

Twenty-nine of the 35 respondents to the evaluation form replied to the first open ended question soliciting their perceptions of the institute's high point. Three of these respondents provided answers with two themes.

Twenty-two respondents reported that the presenters had been the high point of the institute. Fifteen of these mentioned at least one presenter by name. The networking and discussions were the high point, according to four respondents, and the useful materials to two others. Four replies were idiosyncratic. One reported that the high point had been "applying knowledge at my school." Another thought that the opportunity to present work to the state school superintendents had been most valuable. One simply said that there were "lots of high points." And another made two comments either overheard at the institute or that were relevant to the question posed: "Comment—a child has

just one chance at 2nd grade. Another comment—We are experimenting with the very neediest, poor children who have no other resources."

Eighteen respondents replied to the prompt for suggestions to improve the institute. Time was the focus of eight respondents' answers. Of these, four requested more time with the presenters; another requested more time for state planning. Two respondents reported that they had no suggestions for improvement, and another two gave positive feedback about the event. Two respondents suggested that the institute only be scheduled during weekdays rather than on Saturday. Four replies were unique. One respondent suggested greater focus, requesting a "day long focus on [a] single concept." Another suggested shortening presentations of state stories, while, similarly, another wrote, "less on our presentation." "Friday's format could be reviewed," wrote yet another respondent.

Sixteen of the 35 evaluation form respondents answered the final open ended question seeking their remaining concerns. Six respondents replied that they had no concerns to report, two of whom also praised AEL and the Academy. Three respondents were concerned that they had so much yet to learn about external facilitation and school reform; one of these participants also requested that Academy participation be extended to a third year. The remaining replies were idiosyncratic and are presented in Table 14.

Table 14
Remaining Responses to Question C3

Idiosyncratic Responses to Question C3
"How to fit EF [external facilitation] into my job."
"Future."
"Facilitating change in schools without being an advocate."
"Just more of the innovative, on-the-edge learning."
"Preparing schools to sustain change."
"Can I transfer all of this into successful outcomes for students? Really help charge my profession into a caring, competent workforce for America's kids?"
"I think we need [to] work more together."

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from the data collected at the 2000 summer institute of the Academy for External Facilitators. Comparative data also yield a few conclusions.

The four individual sessions that participants were asked to evaluate were very well-received. Presenters were competent, and their presentations were professional and appealing. Although these sessions did not necessarily engage participants actively in communicating with their colleagues or involve them meaningfully, this was not of serious concern to evaluation form respondents.

Taken as a whole, the 2000 institute provided useful information and materials to attendees, with responsive and knowledgeable assistance from AEL staff and presenters. In addition, various logistics of the event were satisfactory to most evaluation form respondents.

Moreover, institute objectives were met well. Participants completed the institute with a broadened understanding of school reform and the change process, as well as an increased repertoire of external facilitation strategies. Although planning objectives were somewhat less well achieved than others, participants were not overly concerned with this.

Attendees were very pleased with the presentations given by renowned education consultants and speakers. In fact, several suggested that the institute might have been improved had more time been allotted them. Networking opportunities were also useful to several attendees.

More time could have been provided for states to plan their future reform work. But, overall, attendees were quite pleased with the institute and reported very little need for improvement of the event.

A few participants were concerned about the how much learning they felt they still needed in order to be successful external facilitators. Several attendees had lingering concerns about the efficacy of their work and the challenges they faced.

External facilitators possessed the most skills and knowledge in terms of collaborative leadership, the change process, school reform, decision making, listening, and communicating. Overall, participants felt their skill and knowledge levels were moderately high in these areas. They were least skilled and knowledgeable with regard to CSRDnet and technology.

External facilitators participating in both the 1999 and 2000 institutes were significantly and substantially more skilled and knowledgeable in 2000 with regard to school reform, reform models and strategies, technological abilities, CSRDnet, team building, group process, resource identification, network development, the change process, environmental scanning, and situational analysis. And to a lesser extent, external facilitators were also more skilled and knowledgeable about collaborative leadership.

Overall, attendees at the 2000 institute were less concerned about their roles as external facilitators than they had been the previous year. Although they remained most concerned about their awareness of the innovation and collaboration with others, they also continued to have a high concern

for information about external facilitation. External facilitators were least concerned about the consequences or outcomes of their work, as they had been the previous year. Individuals were most concerned with either awareness and information about the innovation, or awareness and collaboration with others.

External facilitators who had participated in the 1999 and 2000 institutes were significantly and substantially less concerned about their awareness of the innovation, information levels, personal issues, and management considerations than they had been in 1999. Their levels of concern about collaboration and refocusing remained fairly stable in 1999 and 2000.

In sum, external facilitators found the 2000 institute useful and pleasant to attend. Moreover, participants have strengthened external facilitation skills and have less intense concern about their roles as external facilitators

.

Recommendations

Recommendations for future External Facilitator Academy institutes are made below based upon the data collected during the 2000 summer event.

AEL staff should continue to offer external facilitators the opportunity to hear significant presentations on school reform. However, AEL staff should take participants' suggestions for improvement into account when developing future institutes. Such suggestions include scheduling institutes during weekdays, providing more time for participants to listen to and speak with presenters, and providing more time for state planning.

Because external facilitation requires so many skills and much knowledge about school change, AEL could provide external facilitators with ongoing access to Academy resources and events. Mechanisms to ensure this have already been established in some instances, including additional Academy meetings and access to CSRDnet.

Although external facilitators' skills and knowledge in many areas have developed substantially during their participation in the Academy, others have not. AEL staff should focus their efforts in future Academy events on enriching external facilitators' skills and knowledge about, for instance, data interpretation or diversity. In addition, participants continue to have the least amount of efficacy with regard to technology and CSRDnet. AEL staff might consider offering additional training, information, or support in these areas.

To conclude, CSRD staff should continue to offer high quality information, materials, presentations, and other support to external facilitators as they continue their reform work. The success of the 2000 institute suggests that participants have appreciated the Academy, and more importantly, found it of use to their undertakings.

REFERENCES

American Institutes for Research. (1999). *An educators' guide to schoolwide reform.* Educational Research Service: Arlington, VA. Retrieved July 16, 1999, from the World Wide Web: http://www.aasa.org/Reform

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). *Statistical methods in education and psychology* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, G. E., George, A. A., and Rutherford, W. L. (1977). *Measuring stages of concern about the innovation: A manual for use of the SoC questionnaire.* Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas at Austin.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

New American Schools. (1999). *New American Schools and the Education Commission of the States: CSRD implementation project 1999.* Author: Arlington, VA. Retrieved January 27, 2000, from the World Wide Web: http://naschools.org/csrd/index.html

Phillips, J. L. (1982). *Statistical thinking* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A:

Stages of Concern (SoC) Questionnaire

Concerns Questionnaire

Name (Optional) _____

Date Completed _____

It is very important for continuity in processing the data associated with your participation in the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators that we have a unique number that you can remember. Please record your Academy ID number:

____ ____ ____ ____

The purpose of this questionnaire is to determine what people who are using or thinking about using various programs are concerned about at various times during the innovation adoption process. The items were developed from typical responses of school and college teachers who ranged from "no knowledge at all" about various programs to "many years experience" in using them. Therefore, **a good part of the items on this questionnaire appear to be of little relevance or irrelevant to you at this time.** For the completely irrelevant items, please circle "0" on the scale. Other items will represent those concerns you **do** have, in varying degrees of intensity, and should be marked higher on the scale, according to the explanation at the top of each of the following pages.

For example:

This statement is very true of me at this time.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 (7)
This statement is somewhat true of me now.	0 1 2 3 (4) 5 6 7
This statement is not at all true of me at this time.	0 (1) 2 3 4 5 6 7
This statement is irrelevant to me.	(0) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please respond to the item in terms of **your present concerns,** or how you feel about your involvement or potential involvement with the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators. We do not hold to any one definition of this program, so please think of it in terms of **your own perceptions** of what it involves. Since this questionnaire is used for a variety of innovations, the name of the Academy never appears. However, phrases such as "the innovation," "this approach," and "the new system" all refer to the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators. Remember to respond to each item in terms of **your present concerns** about your involvement or potential involvement with the AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators.

Thank you for taking time to complete this task.

Copyright © 1989
Concerns Based Systems International

Please continue on the next page.

SCALE

0 ---------- 1 ---------- 2 ---------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5 ---------- 6 ---------- 7

Irrelevant Not true of me now Somewhat true of me now Very true of me now

1. I am concerned about students' attitudes toward this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I now know of some other approaches that might work better.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I don't even know what the innovation is.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I am concerned about not having enough time to organize myself each day.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I would like to help other faculty in their use of the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I have a very limited knowledge about the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I would like to know the effect of reorganization on my professional status.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am concerned about conflict between my interests and my responsibilities.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I am concerned about revising my use of the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. I would like to develop working relationships with both our faculty and outside faculty using this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I am concerned about how the innovation will affect students.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I am not concerned about this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I would like to know who will make the decisions in the new system.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I would like to discuss the possibility of using the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I would like to know what resources are available if we decide to adopt this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I am concerned about my inability to manage all that the innovation requires.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I would like to know how my teaching or administration is supposed to change.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. I would like to familiarize other departments or persons with the progress of this new approach.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

C - 2

Please continue on the next page.

SCALE

0 ---------- 1 ---------- 2 ---------- 3 ---------- 4 ---------- 5 ---------- 6 ---------- 7

Irrelevant Not true of me now Somewhat true of me now Very true of me now

19. I am concerned about evaluating my impact on students.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I would like to help others in facilitating the use of this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I am completely occupied with other things.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. I would like to modify our use of the innovation based on the experiences of our students.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Although I don't know about this innovation, I am concerned about things in the area.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I would like to excite my students about their part in this approach.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I am concerned about time spent working with nonacademic problems related to this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I would like to know what the use of the innovation will require in the immediate future.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. I would like to coordinate my efforts with others to maximize the innovation's effects.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. I would like to have more information on time and energy commitments required by this innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I would like to know what other faculty are doing in this area.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. At this time, I am interested in learning about the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I would like to determine how to supplement, enhance or replace the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. I would like to use feedback from students to change the program.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. I would like to know how my role will change when I am using the innovation.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. Coordination of tasks and people is taking too much of my time.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. I would like to know how this information is better than what we have now.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX B:

External Facilitator Self-Assessment Questionnaire

AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators
2000 Summer Institute
Self-Assessment Instrument

Please take a few moments to respond to the following items. Your replies will remain anonymous and confidential, so feel free to answer candidly.

Please rate **your current skills/knowledge level** related to . . .

		Limited skills & knowledge									Exceptional skills & knowledge
1.	School reform	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2.	Reform models and strategies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3.	Technological abilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4.	CSRDnet	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5.	Team building	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6.	Group process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7.	Diversity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8.	Communications	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9.	Listening	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10.	Collaborative leadership	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11.	Formative evaluation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12.	Data collection	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13.	Data interpretation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14.	Standards, assessment and testing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15.	Resource identification	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16.	Network development	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17.	The change process	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
18.	Environmental scanning	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
19.	Situational analysis	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
20.	Decision making	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Thank you!

APPENDIX C:

Session Evaluation Forms

Academy ID #:_____

AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators
2000 Summer Institute
Module Evaluation Form:
Facilitating Change in Schools: What Does it Take?
Presenter: Ben Perez

We are interested in continuously improving our services. Please help us to do so by taking a few moments to respond to the following items. Your replies will remain anonymous and confidential, so feel free to answer candidly. Thank you!

Section A: Circle the number that best indicates the extent to which the session(s) on **facilitating change in schools . . .**

		Not at all		Neutral		Very much
1.	Had clear outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Included clear directions for activities	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Facilitated development of new skills	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Was conducted in an appealing manner	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Was conducted in a professional manner	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Had activities that were well sequenced	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Had activities that reinforced the content	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Included appropriate examples	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Was relevant to my needs	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Had meaningful involvement of participants	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Caused me to reflect on my practices	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Increased communication and collegiality with others	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Increased my understanding of what it takes to facilitate change in schools	1	2	3	4	5

Section B: Listed below are objectives for the session on facilitating change. You are asked to rate each objective on two dimensions: 1) knowledge you gained during the session, and 2) your need for further information regarding the objective. **Scale:** 1 = None or not at all to 5 = Very much or a lot

		Knowledge gain					**Further need**				
18.	Expanded my knowledge of external facilitation for comprehensive school reform	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Expanded my repertoire of external facilitation skills for comprehensive school reform	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Academy ID #:_____

AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators
2000 Summer Institute
Module Evaluation Form:
School Reform: Understanding Dimensions of Change
Presenter: Andrew Hargreaves

We are interested in continuously improving our services. Please help us to do so by taking a few moments to respond to the following items. Your replies will remain anonymous and confidential, so feel free to answer candidly. Thank you!

Section A: Circle the number that best indicates the extent to which the session(s) on **understanding dimensions of change** . . .

		Not at all		Neutral		Very much
1.	Had clear outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Included clear directions for activities	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Facilitated development of new skills	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Was conducted in an appealing manner	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Was conducted in a professional manner	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Had activities that were well sequenced	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Had activities that reinforced the content	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Included appropriate examples	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Was relevant to my needs	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Had meaningful involvement of participants	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Caused me to reflect on my practices	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Increased communication and collegiality with others	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Increased my understanding of the dimensions of change	1	2	3	4	5

Section B: Listed below is the objective for the session on understanding dimensions of change. You are asked to rate the objective on two scales: 1) knowledge you gained during the session, and 2) your need for further information regarding the objective.

Scale: 1 = None or not at all to 5 = Very much or a lot

		Knowledge gain					**Further need**				
18.	Expanded my understanding of how change is planned, managed and implemented	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Academy ID #:_____

AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators
2000 Summer Institute
Module Evaluation Form:
Creating Change-Adept Schools
Presenter: Phil Schlechty

We are interested in continuously improving our services. Please help us to do so by taking a few moments to respond to the following items. Your replies will remain anonymous and confidential, so feel free to answer candidly. Thank you!

Section A: Circle the number that best indicates the extent to which the session on **creating change-adept schools . . .**

		Not at all		Neutral		Very much
1.	Had clear outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Included clear directions for activities	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Facilitated development of new skills	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Was conducted in an appealing manner	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Was conducted in a professional manner	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Had activities that were well sequenced	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Had activities that reinforced the content	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Included appropriate examples	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Was relevant to my needs	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Had meaningful involvement of participants	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Caused me to reflect on my practices	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Increased communication and collegiality with others	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Increased my understanding of how to create change-adept schools	1	2	3	4	5

Section B: Listed below is the objective for the session with model developers. You are asked to rate the objective on two dimensions: 1) knowledge you gained during the session, and 2) your need for further information regarding the objective. **Scale:** 1 = None or not at all to 5 = Very much or a lot

		Knowledge gain					**Further need**				
18.	Gained knowledge about the creation of change-adept schools	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

Academy ID #:_____

AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators
2000 Summer Institute
Module Evaluation Form:
The Role of the District in School Reform
Presenter: Dale Kalkofen

We are interested in continuously improving our services. Please help us to do so by taking a few moments to respond to the following items. Your replies will remain anonymous and confidential, so feel free to answer candidly. Thank you!

Section A: Circle the number that best indicates the extent to which the session(s) on **the role of the district in school reform . . .**

		Not at all		Neutral		Very much
1.	Had clear outcomes	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Included clear directions for activities	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Facilitated development of new skills	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Was conducted in an appealing manner	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Was conducted in a professional manner	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Was conducted by competent presenter(s)	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Had activities that were well sequenced	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Had activities that reinforced the content	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Included appropriate examples	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Was relevant to my needs	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Had meaningful involvement of participants	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Caused me to reflect on my practices	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Caused me to examine some of my attitudes	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Stimulated me to want to use the concepts, skills, and/or materials presented	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Provided materials that will be useful to me in my continuing work as an external facilitator	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Increased communication and collegiality with others	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Increased my understanding of the role of the school district in school reform	1	2	3	4	5

Section B: Listed below are the objectives for the session(s) on the role of the district in reform. You are asked to rate each objective on two dimensions: 1) knowledge you gained during the session, and 2) your need for further information regarding the objective.

Scale: 1 = None or not at all to 5 = Very much or a lot

		Knowledge gai					**Further need**				
18.	Enhanced my knowledge of the role of the district in school reform	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
19.	Increased my capacity to work with district staff	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX D:

Overall Institute Evaluation Form

Academy ID #:_____

AEL CSRD Academy for External Facilitators
2000 Summer Institute
Overall Institute Evaluation Form

We are interested in continuously improving our services. Please help us to do so by taking a few moments to respond to the following items. Your replies will remain confidential and anonymous, so feel free to answer candidly.

Section A. Please rate the following items about this Institute using the scales provided, circling the number that best corresponds to your reply.

1. Did AEL carry out planned activities at the times scheduled?	Never 1	2	Some 3	4	Always 5
2. How responsive were AEL staff and/or presenters to your requests for service and/or assistance during the Institute?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
3. How knowledgeable were AEL staff and/or presenters?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
4. How skilled were AEL staff and/or presenters in completing their tasks?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
5. How well were your information needs met at this Institute?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
6. How useful were the materials provided to you during this Institute?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
7. How satisfied were you with the location of this event?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
8. How satisfied were you with the format of this Institute?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
9. How satisfied were you with the meeting facilities at this event?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5
10. How useful do you anticipate this Institute will be to your work?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	Very 5

Section B. Using the scale provided, please rate the extent to which each of the following Institute objectives were met.

1. To what extent did the Institute broaden your understanding of school reform and the change process?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
3. To what extent did you increase your repertoire of strategies for helping schools build their capacity for continuous improvement?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. To what extent did you assist to inform your state's future reform efforts through sharing lessons learned?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
5. To what extent were you able to expand your resource network?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
6. To what extent did you acquire an expanded understanding of how change is planned, managed, and implemented?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
7. To what extent was your awareness of the connection between policy and practice in states broadened?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
8. To what extent did you develop new collegial relationships?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
9. To what extent did you learn from other participants?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
10. To what extent do you feel better prepared to work effectively with model developers and others providing services to school?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
11. To what extent were your external facilitation skills augmented?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
12. To what extent was your knowledge of external facilitation enhanced?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
13. To what extent was the opportunity to reflect on Year 1 with your state colleagues useful?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5
14. To what extent was the opportunity to plan for Year 2 with your state colleagues useful?	Not at all 1	2	Some 3	4	A lot 5

Section C. Please respond to the following prompts.

1. The high point of this Institute was . . .

2. The Institute could have been improved by . . .

3. Concerns I still have are . . .

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Thank you!

APPENDIX F:

Completed Evaluation *Standards* Checklist

External Facilitators

Agenda

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2000 Summer Institute Goals

To help participants

- broaden their understanding of school reform and the change process
- increase their repertoire of strategies for helping schools build capacity for continuous improvement
- inform their state's future reform efforts through the distillation of lessons learned
- expand their resource networks

Wednesday, August 2

Objectives

1. Clarify the purpose and scope of the 2000 Summer Institute
2. Capture lessons learned from the first year of CSRD implementation

9:00 a.m.	–	12:00 p.m.	Participant Arrival Check-in
12:00 p.m.	–	1:00 p.m.	Registration
1:00 p.m.	–	2:00 p.m.	**Opening Luncheon** *Airlie Dining Room* Welcome Billie Hauser, Director of REL School Reform, AEL, Inc. Pamela Lutz, Executive Vice President, AEL, Inc.
2:00 p.m.	–	2:15 p.m.	Break
2:15 p.m.	–	3:15 p.m.	**Plenary Session** *Federal Room* **School Change: Who's Saying What? Who's Doing What?** Betty Hale, Vice President, IEL Billie Hauser, Director of REL School Reform, AEL, Inc. David Wallace, Sequoyah Group
3:15 p.m.	–	5:30 p.m.	**CSRD Lessons Learned: Insights from State Partners** Small Group Activity
5:30 p.m.	–	6:30 p.m.	Break Check-In
6:30 p.m.	–	7:30 p.m.	Dinner *Airlie Dining Room*

Thursday, August 3

Objectives

1. Expand understanding of how change is planned, managed, and implemented
2. Foster broader awareness of the policy and practice connection in states

7:00 a.m. – 8:00 a.m. *Airlie Dining Room*	Breakfast Buffet
8:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *Federal Room*	**Plenary Session** **School Reform: Exploring Change Issues**
10:30 a.m. – 10:45 a.m.	Break
10:45 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.	**School Reform: Understanding Dimensions of Change** Presenter, Andy Hargreaves, Co-director and Professor, Center for Educational Change, Theory, and Policy Studies in Education, University of Toronto
12:00 p.m. – 1:00 p.m. *Airlie Dining Room*	Lunch
1:00 p.m. – 1:30 p.m. *Federal Room*	**Insights: The Morning Session**
1:30 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	**State Meetings** Kentucky — West Room Tennessee — Garden Room Virginia — Studio West Virginia — Foxes Den
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	**CSRD in the States: Sharing Insights with the Chief State School Officers**
5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Break
6:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. *East Room*	Wine and Cheese Reception with the Chief State School Officers
7:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. *Airlie Dining Room*	Dinner

Friday, August 4

Objectives

1. Increase capacity to work more effectively with model developers and others providing services to schools
2. Expand knowledge and skills of external facilitation for comprehensive school reform

7:00 a.m. – 8:00 a.m. *Airlie Dining Room*	Breakfast Buffet
8:15 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. *Federal Room*	Overview of the Day, Updates, Announcements
8:30 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.	**Plenary Session** **Facilitating Change in Schools: What Does it Take?** Facilitator, Ben Perez, Principal, Transformations, Inc.
9:45 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.	**Facilitating School Reform: Concurrent Breakout Sessions** (See Schedule, next page)
11:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	Break
11:15 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	**Facilitating School Reform: Concurrent Breakout Sessions** (See Schedule, next page)
12:30 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. *East Room*	Lunch **Working Collaboratively: A Dialogue with Model Developers** John Batchelor (Success for All) Bob Blum (Onward Toward Excellence II) Ron Heady (Modern Red Schoolhouse) Connie Jones (Core Knowledge)
2:30 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.	**Facilitating School Reform: Concurrent Breakout Sessions** (See Schedule, next page)
3:45 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Break
4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	**State Meetings** Kentucky West Room Tennessee Garden Room Virginia Studio West Virginia Foxes Den
5:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Break
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. *Smokehouse*	Cook Out/Barbecue

Facilitating School Reform: Concurrent Sessions				
9:45-11:00	Kentucky: Helping Schools Use Data ***Presenter, Steve Moats, AEL*** ***Federal Room***	Making Comprehensive School Reform Work ***Presenter, Laura Desimone, AIR*** ***Studio***	West Virginia: Helping Schools Use Data ***Presenter, Steve Moats, AEL*** ***Federal Room***	A Four-State Perspective on CSRD: A Dialogue ***Presenters, Billie Hauser, AEL*** ***Wendy Togneri, Learning First*** ***Garden Room***
11:00-11:45	**Break and Travel**			
11:15-12:30	Tennessee: Helping Schools Use Data ***Presenter, Steve Moats, AEL*** ***Federal Room***	Making Comprehensive School Reform Work ***Presenter, Laura Desimone, AIR*** ***Studio***	Partners in School Reform ***Presenter, Joan Buckley, AFT*** ***Foxes Den***	The Role of the District in School Reform ***Presenter, Dale Kalkofen, NAS*** ***Garden Room***
12:30-2:15	**Lunch**			
2:30-3:45	A Four-State Perspective on CSRD: A Dialogue ***Presenters, Billie Hauser, AEL*** ***Wendy Togneri, Learning First*** ***West Room***	Virginia: Helping Schools Use Data ***Presenter, Bob Bourdeaux, VDE*** ***Studio***	Partners in School Reform ***Presenters, Joan Buckley, AFT*** ***Denise Alston, NEA*** ***Foxes Den***	The Role of the District in School Reform ***Presenter, Dale Kalkofen, NAS*** ***Garden Room***

Saturday, August 5

Objectives

1. Provide opportunity for states to reflect on Year I and plan for Year 2
2. Celebrate and acknowledge contributions of external facilitators

7:00 a.m. – 8:00 a.m. *Airlie Dining Room*	Breakfast Buffet
8:30 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *Federal Room*	**What do I do on Monday?** Facilitator, Ben Perez, Principal, Transformations, Inc. **State Meetings** Kentucky West Room Tennessee Garden Room Virginia Studio West Virginia Foxes Den
10:30 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.	Check out
11:15 a.m. – 1:00 p.m. *East Room*	**Recognition Luncheon** **Creating Change-Adept Schools** Presenter, Phil Schlechty, President and CEO of the Center for Leadership in School Reform Safe Travel Home

APPENDIX E:

2000 Institute Agenda

Checklist for Applying the Standards

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *The Program Evaluation Standards* (1994), Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.

The Standards were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor		The Standard was addressed	The Standard was partially addressed	The Standard was not addressed	The Standard was not applicable
U1	Stakeholder Identification	✓			
U2	Evaluator Credibility	✓			
U3	Information Scope and Selection	✓			
U4	Values Identification	✓			
U5	Report Clarity	✓			
U6	Report Timeliness and Dissemination	✓			
U7	Evaluation Impact	✓			
F1	Practical Procedures	✓			
F2	Political Viability				✓
F3	Cost Effectiveness	✓			
P1	Service Orientation	✓			
P2	Formal Agreements	✓			
P3	Rights of Human Subjects	✓			
P4	Human Interactions	✓			
P5	Complete and Fair Assessment	✓			
P6	Disclosure of Findings	✓			
P7	Conflict of Interest	✓			
P8	Fiscal Responsibility	✓			
A1	Program Documentation	✓			
A2	Context Analysis	✓			
A3	Described Purposes and Procedures	✓			
A4	Defensible Information Sources	✓			
A5	Valid Information	✓			
A6	Reliable Information	✓			
A7	Systematic Information	✓			
A8	Analysis of Quantitative Information	✓			
A9	Analysis of Qualitative Information	✓			
A10	Justified Conclusions	✓			
A11	Impartial Reporting	✓			
A12	Metaevaluation	✓			

The Program Evaluation Standards (1994, Sage) guided the development of this (check one):

____ request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
____ evaluation plan/design/proposal
____ evaluation contract
✓ evaluation report
____ other: _____

Name Caitlin Howley-Rowe Date 9/27/00
Caitlin Howley-Rowe
(signature)
Position or Title Research Associate
Agency AEL
Address PO Box 1348 Chas WV 25325
Relation to Document author
(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)